

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pedersen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,717 B1). In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 15, 17 and 18 and have cancelled claims 9, 11, and 12. Accordingly, claims 1-8, 10, and 13-18 will be pending after entry of this Amendment.

### **I. Amendment to the Specification and Drawings**

In this Amendment, Applicants have corrected four typographical errors in the drawings and three typographical errors in the specification. No new matter had been added, as all the corrections are supported by the discussion in the specification and by the illustrations in the figures. Specifically, Applicants moved a “From 615” transitional arrow that previously pointed to operation 660 in the flowchart illustrated in Figure 6B to now point to the operation 655. This change is supported by (1) the referenced transition from 615 to 655 in Figure 6A, (2) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 5-7, and (3) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 8-22, which provides the rationale as to why the process 600 of Figure 6 transitions to 655 from 615 and 645.

Applicants also corrected the description of the operation 1445 in Figure 14. This correction is supported by the description in the specification on page 51, lines 15-17. In addition, Applicants added a “From 2242” transitional arrow to operation 2228 on Figure 22B. This correction is supported by the description in the specification on page 72, lines 14-15. Applicants also corrected the numbering of operation 2246 in Figure 22C. This correction is supported by the description in the specification on page 72, lines 19-20.

In the specification on page 31, Applicants changed an inaccurate reference to a transition from 615 to 660 in Figure 6B, to an accurate reference regarding a transition from 615 to 655. As mentioned above, this change is supported by (1) the referenced transition from 615 to 655 in

Figure 6A, (2) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 5-7, and (3) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 8-22, which provides the rationale as to why the process 600 of Figure 6 transitions to 655 from 615 and 645.

On page 72, line 13, Applicants have also changed "2242" to "2202." This is a reference number for the operation that the process 2200 of Figures 22A-22C performs to generate several graphs. As mentioned in the specification on page 65, line 1 to page 66, line 16, the process 2200 generates these graphs at 2202. *See also* page 70, lines 15-17. Finally, on page 73, lines 2-3, Applicants have changed "[a]fter 2244, the process ends," to "[a]fter 2246, the process ends." As shown in Figure 22C, the process 2200 ends after it completes the database tables; as specified in the specification, the process 2200 completes the database tables at 2246, which proceeds 2244 in Figure 22C. *See* page 72, lines 19-20.

## **II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

In paragraphs 3-10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pedersen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,717 B1, hereinafter Pedersen). In regards to claim 1, the Examiner did not address each limitation of claim 1 and addressed certain limitations not included in the claims of the present application. Rather, the Examiner recited certain limitations that are included in the claims of a related application (having serial number 10/062,047) concurrently filed by Applicants on 1/31/2002.

The Applicants are amending claim 1 and, as the rejection might be applied to the amended claim, respectfully traverse. Claim 1 as amended recites a method comprising:

- a) receiving a design that is not bounded to a particular technology;
- b) repeatedly:
  - selecting from the design a candidate sub-network;
  - identifying at least one replacement sub-network from a storage structure that stores replacement sub-networks that are bound to the particular technology; and

replacing the selected candidate sub-network in the design with the replacement sub-network;

c) wherein at least a particular one of the selected candidate sub-networks has multiple circuit elements that provide multiple outputs of the particular candidate sub-network.

Pedersen does not teach or suggest each recited feature of claim 1. For example, as recited in claim 1, a candidate sub-network of a design has multiple circuit elements that provide multiple outputs of the candidate sub-network, the candidate sub-network being replaced in the design by a replacement sub-network. Although the Examiner did not address this limitation in the Office Action, Applicants submit that Pedersen does not teach or suggest this limitation. In fact, Pedersen makes no mention of replaceable candidate sub-networks having multiple outputs. As such, Applicants submit that claim 1 is in allowable form. Claims 2-8, 10, and 13, and 14 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claim 15 is a computer readable medium claim that includes the “multiple output” limitation of claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons given for claim 1. Claims 16-18 are dependent on claim 15 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

### **III. Information Disclosure Statement**

Accompanying this Amendment is the 1449 form of an Information Disclosure Statement that Applicants are submitting concurrently with but separately from this Amendment. This Information Disclosure Statement lists and provides copies of several additional references for the Examiner's consideration. The Examiner is requested to make these documents of record. Also attached are second and third 1449 forms of Information Disclosure Statements that Applicants have submitted prior to submission of this Amendment but which Examiner has not yet made of record. The Examiner is requested to make these documents of record as well.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that the rejections and objections in the Office Action of September 3, 2003 are fully overcome and that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 2/3/04

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gregory Suh", is written over a horizontal line.

Gregory Suh  
Reg. No. 48,187

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP  
PO Box 51860  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0728  
Phone: (650) 752-0990 ext.104  
Fax: (650) 752-0995

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Attached are four sheets of drawings that include changes to Figures 6B, 14, 22B, and 22C. These sheets replace the original four sheets that included Figures 6B, 14, 22B, and 22C. The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the amended drawings.